

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified patent application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-48 are in this case. Claims 1-8, 10, 14-16, 19, 22, 24, 26, 28 30 and 42-48 have been allowed. Claims 33, 34, 37 and 38 have been objected to. Claims 9, 11-13, 17-18, 20-21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 35-38 and 40-41 have been rejected under § 112. Claims 31, 32, 35, 36 and 39 have been rejected under § 102(b). Claims 40 and 41 have been rejected under § 103 (a).

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance by the Examiner of claims 1-8, 10, 14-16, 19, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30 and 42-48.

In response to the Office action, Applicant has cancelled Claims 31 and 32, and has amended Claims 1, 9, 14, 29, 33, 35, and 39-40.

Independent claim 1 has been amended without any substantial change, using Examiner's suggestion at the bottom of p. 3 of the Office Action. Specifically, "double opponent response" has been also marked "do-response", and "do-remote signal" has been changed to "do-remote response".

Claim 9 has been amended to depend upon claim 7 instead of 1. "Double-opponent surround response" appears in claim 7, and therefore serves as antecedent basis for the limitation in original claim 9. Applicant submits that claim 9 is now in condition for allowance. Original claim 11, which depends upon claim 9, is now similarly in condition for allowance.

Original claims 12 and 13 now have antecedent basis for their limitations, being based directly or indirectly upon claim 7, and through it upon claim 1. Applicant submits that claims 12 and 13 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 14 has been amended to depend upon claim 2 instead of claim 1. This leaves the allowance of claim, as indicated by the Examiner, unchanged. Original claim 17 now depends indirectly through claim 14 upon claim 2, which provides the necessary antecedent basis for "said yellow double-opponent response". Applicant submits that claim 17 now has antecedent basis for its limitation in claim 2, and is therefore in condition for allowance. Original claim 18, which depends through claims 15 and 14 upon claim 2, is now also in condition for allowance.

Original claims 20, 21, 23, 25 and 27 depend directly or indirectly upon claim 17. Applicant submits that, since claim 17 is now in condition for allowance, claims 20, 21, 23, 25 and 27 are all in condition for allowance.

Claim 29 has been amended to read "new center response", which has antecedent basis in claim 28. "New opponent cell responses" are a result of the action described, and therefore needs no antecedent. Applicant submits that with this amendment, claim 29 is placed in condition for allowance.

Per Examiner's suggestion, claim 33 has been amended and rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of base claim 31 and intervening claim 32. Original claim 34 depends upon claim 33, which is now an amended independent claim. Applicant submits that both claim 33 (which the Examiner has indicated it would be allowed if amended as indicated) and claim 34 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 35 has been amended to depend upon claim 33 instead of claim 32. Since claims 35 and 36 (through 35) now depend upon an allowable base claim, Applicant submits that claims 35 and 36 are also in condition for allowance.

Original claims 37 and 38 are dependent upon claim 36, and through it upon base claim 33. Examiner has indicated that an amended claim 33 would be allowable. Therefore, dependent claims should also be in condition for allowance.

Claims 39 and 40 have been amended to depend upon amended base claim 33. If amended claim 33 is allowable, as indicated by the Examiner, then claims 39 and 40 are similarly in condition for allowance.

Claim 41 depends upon claim 36, which as indicated above should be allowed based on its dependency on an amended base claim allowed by the Examiner.

§ 102(b) Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 31, 32, 35, 36 and 39 under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Dahari and Spitzer, J. Optical Society of America, Vol. 13, No. 3 pp. 419-435, 1996. In response, claims 31 and 31 have been cancelled, and claims 35, 36 and 39 have been made dependent upon an amended base claim that was deemed


allowable by the Examiner. In applicant's view, any further discussion re. this rejection is therefore moot.

§ 103(a) Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 40 and 41 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) in view of Dahari and Spitzer above, and further in view of Markandey et al. (US Patent No. 5, 500,904). In view of Applicant's reasoning above, and referring to the amendment of claim 40 to depend upon base claim 33, Applicant believes that by having both claims 40 and 41 dependent directly or indirectly upon an allowable base claim, they are now in condition for allowance.

In conclusion, in view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 9, 11-13, 17-18, 20-21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 33 and 35-41 are in condition for allowance. Prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark M. Friedman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 33,883

Date: August 9, 2004